



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/542,850 | 06/13/2006 | Hans-Detlef Luginsland | 274669US0PCT | 5763 |
| 22850 | 7590 | 08/06/2010 | | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| PARVINI, PEGAH | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 1793 | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/06/2010 | | ELECTRONIC | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

1
2
3 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
5

6
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
8 AND INTERFERENCES
9

10 Ex parte HANS-DETLEF LUGINSLAND,
11 ANDRE WEHMEIER, OLEG STENZEL,
12 and STEFAN UHRLANDT
13

14
15 Appeal 2010-001210
16 Application 10/542,850
17 Technology Center 1700
18

19
20 Oral Hearing Held: July 15, 2010
21
22

23 Before TERRY J. OWENS, TONI R. SCHEINER and MARK NAGUMO,
24 Administrative Patent Judges.
25

26
27 On Behalf of the Appellants:
28

29
30 KIRSTEN A. GRUNEBERG, Ph.D., ESQ.
31 Oblon, Spivak, McClelland, Maier & Neustadt, L.L.P.
32 1940 Duke Street
33 Alexandria, Virginia 22314
34 (713) 412-7050
35
36

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Thursday, July 15,
2 2010, commencing at 9:30 a.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office,
3 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room A, Alexandria, Virginia, before
4 Kevin Carr, court reporter.

5 THE USHER: Calendar Number 16, 2010-001210, DR.
6 GRUNEBERG.

7 DR. GRUNEBERG: Good morning. I have a copy of the
8 Appeal Brief and my business card. Well, may it please the Board, I think
9 I'd like to immediately like to jump into what the issue is here in this case.
10 As you know, we're claiming a precipitated silica having various chemical
11 and physical properties, and I need my glasses to see. I apologize. And the
12 question or one of the important questions in the case is whether the
13 references disclose a certain number of Silanol groups per surface area, in
14 other words a high Silanol groups density. And why is it important? It's
15 important as discussed in the Appeal Brief at page 4 and also in the
16 Specification at page 5 to page 6.

17 The precipitated silicates of the invention have not only a high
18 absolute number of Silanol groups as expressed by the Sears value, V2, but
19 also in comparison with other precipitated silica, a markedly increased ratio
20 of Sears value to BET's surface area. And what that means is that there is a
21 very high number of Silanol groups based on the total surface area.

22 Now, the Esch reference, as you also very well know from the
23 Appeal Brief, discloses broad ranges of the BET surface area as well as a
24 Sears number; and the Examiner has argued throughout prosecution that,
25 well, you can just divide the two and then you come up with something that
26 is close to what we are doing. Well, our argument is that if you look at the

1 examples of the Esch reference you can of course calculate a certain ratio of
2 Sears value to BET surface area, and even their highest value based on the
3 examples comes up short. It's 25% lower than the lowest limit that we are
4 claiming. And it's really not so much.

5 Of course, you can disclose as Esch does a range of Silanol
6 groups but the question is is that number based on a football field or is it
7 based on, you know, the size of my glasses. So that's really the question.
8 That's the difference, and our argument is that if you look at the examples, if
9 Esch had had this particular ratio that we are claiming, they would have
10 exemplified that; and, moreover, only one of the precipitated silicas that
11 Esch exemplifies, namely the Example 3, became a commercial product.

12 Now, if you think about the examples that we have compared to
13 exactly Example number 3, which became a commercial product of Esch;
14 and, it is shown that we achieve much better organization times, greater
15 vulcanization rates, lower Mooney viscosities. And that is clearly based on
16 more Silanol groups on a smaller area, BET surface area. So, really the main
17 argument is that the Esch reference simply did not have the particular ratio
18 and the other references, the Boyer reference, Luginsland, as well as
19 Urlandt, did not have the ratio as well. And that is a summary of my
20 argument.

21 JUDGE NAGUMO: Is this a matter of failure of prima facie
22 obviousness or a matter of unexpected results? Because Esch does teach a
23 range of BET surface areas, so all of the data is, well, at least in the ranges is
24 there. And I take it you don't contest that Esch is at least generic in some
25 sense to what you're claiming.

1 DR. GRUNEBERG: I do contest that because what I'm saying
2 is yes, Esch discloses a general broad range of Silanol groups. Yes, they do
3 have a certain BET surface area, but what they don't show at all anywhere,
4 neither in the broad disclosure nor in the examples, is a precipitated silica
5 that has a very high ratio of the Sears value to BET surface area.

6 JUDGE NAGUMO: Well, that would be anticipation.

7 DR. GRUNEBERG: Correct. I understand what you're saying.
8 I understand what you're saying, but the key is that they really have, you
9 know, a large density of Silanol groups on a small surface area and they
10 didn't. They just broadly had a certain range of Silanol groups, but they
11 didn't tell us is that in a large area or in a small area. We don't know. And
12 remember the Esch reference, as well as Luginsland and Uhrlandt, they're all
13 the same Assignee as this present case, so they're all from the same
14 company. And, clearly, if they had had this, they would have written this in
15 the specification. They would have exemplified and they would have made
16 a product out of it because it's much better than what they have.

17 JUDGE NAGUMO: Well, but how do I distinguish cases,
18 some of the alloy cases, for example, like Peterson and Harris where the
19 court has indicated that if you had broad ranges disclosed and to come with
20 the claim that is within those ranges, often there is prima facie obviousness.
21 So my question in a sense, are these results that you're presenting
22 unexpected?

23 DR. GRUNEBERG: Yes.

24 JUDGE NAGUMO: And in a sense we know why these things
25 interact with the silicates because of the Silanol groups interacting with the
26 rubbers. Those are available for reaction with groups.

1 DR. GRUNEBERG: That's right.

2 JUDGE NAGUMO: So if you have more of them per unit area,
3 you would expect more. So in that sense it would be an expected result. So
4 that's why I have this question. Should I look at this as a failure of prima
5 facie obviousness or as unexpected results.

6 DR. GRUNEBERG: Well, I think the first step is that I would
7 argue the failure of prima facie obviousness. Now, I understand what you're
8 saying. They're the broad ranges, so it must be there. But in this particular
9 art it is not very easy to actually pack as many Silanol groups. That's really
10 the crux of the invention. You have to pack as many Silanol groups on a
11 specific surface area, and that's, you know, where I sort of anticipated that
12 you would ask a question. But even if, you know, the Examiner, or you
13 think there's a prima facie case of obviousness, then we come in with the
14 data and we are showing that, you know, we actually were able to pack as
15 many Silanol groups on a very small surface area and therefore achieve, you
16 know, all the properties that we have in the declaration.

17 JUDGE NAGUMO: What evidence would you point to in the
18 record that we could make that finding, that it was hard to achieve the
19 densities or it was not known how to achieve those densities in the prior art
20 compared to what you've done now?

21 DR. GRUNEBERG: Right. Most notably, we have the
22 declaration with the Example 3 of Esch, which is again we believe the
23 closest prior art. That's the best example they have. They commercialized
24 it. That's the only commercial product they have. So if you compare to that
25 why in the world if they had a great ratio as we are having, why didn't they
26 put it in there? Why didn't they commercialize it right then, same company.

1 They could have done it. They didn't, because they didn't have it. It didn't
2 have the density of Silanol groups.

3 JUDGE OWENS: Well the question is would it have suggested
4 to one of ordinary skill in the art maybe more than they disclosed.

5 JUDGE NAGUMO: Is this basically an enablement, the prior
6 art is not capable of obtaining these --

7 DR. GRUNEBERG: I have not specifically argued on the
8 record enablement, but if you want to go down that road, probably we could
9 argue that, but I have not argued that on the record, so.

10 JUDGE NAGUMO: Well, we are dealing with rejections of
11 record and I'm trying to probe which of these options here for patentability
12 you were urging us to follow, I mean specifically. Because of course you
13 would like us to, so I'm looking for the evidence that you would point to that
14 would assist us.

15 DR. GRUNEBERG: The evidence that I'm pointing to is that
16 the Esch reference, which is the closest prior art, did not have the specific
17 ratio. It is not disclosed, and the examples, most notably Example 3, which
18 became a commercial product, did not have the specific ratio that we are
19 claiming. And, again, and I'm repeating myself. I realize that if they had
20 had the ratio they would have made it a product right then, and they did not,
21 so.

22 JUDGE OWENS: If you go to Esch's column 2, line 13 or so,
23 there's a table there.

24 DR. GRUNEBERG: Yeah.

1 JUDGE OWENS: If you divide Sears value by BET surface
2 area and multiply that by 5, how is that number not comparable to what is in
3 your Claim 1.

4 DR. GRUNEBERG: Can you please repeat the column and line
5 number?

6 JUDGE OWENS: Column 2, line 13.

7 DR. GRUNEBERG: Oh, yeah. That's the broad disclosure of
8 Escher.

9 JUDGE OWENS: You divide the Sears value by the BET
10 surface area and multiply by 5.

11 DR. GRUNEBERG: Right.

12 JUDGE OWENS: Can't you get numbers that are similar to the
13 ones in the range in your Claim 1?

14 DR. GRUNEBERG: I understand what you're saying, and that
15 again goes back to the argument. Yes, they have, you know, the broad
16 ranges, but they're not telling us really how to achieve a very specific ratio,
17 just because I have a large, general Silanol number. It's not correlated to a
18 specific BET surface area and so I could have a total Silanol number on a
19 very large surface area, so having a very small density, which is very
20 different from what we are doing.

21 So what I'm trying to say is just dividing those numbers -- and
22 we argued that on the record as well -- just dividing those numbers is not
23 going to get you the ratio. You would come up with the ratio, because you
24 wouldn't be able. They're not telling us that they're actually packing those
25 Silanols on a very small BET surface area.

1 JUDGE OWENS: It gives you milliliters per five meters
2 squared. What's missing from that?

3 DR. GRUNEBERG: Right. I understand what you're saying,
4 but again, where here do they show that they have a specific density? They
5 don't show it. They just have the broad ranges. It's not there so that's the
6 argument.

7 JUDGE NAGUMO: Is there evidence in the record that the
8 importance of the ratio was not known that the Sears value, V2 to BET, is
9 there evidence that this was not recognized? And is it possible now -- or let
10 me stick with the first question.

11 DR. GRUNEBERG: Okay. Again, if the specific ratio had
12 been recognized by Esch as being important they would have described it
13 and they did not. They would have exemplified it, and they did not. They
14 probably would have commercialized a product because a product with that
15 ratio is better. We are showing that, and they did not, so that's --

16 JUDGE NAGUMO: Thank you. No more questions?

17 JUDGE OWENS: No more questions.

18 DR. GRUNEBERG: Okay. Well, thank you so much for your
19 time. I appreciate it.

20 Whereupon, at 9:46 a.m., the proceedings were concluded.
21
22
23
24
25